

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

KEITH BOX,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 1:05CV6 HEA
)	
CHUCK DWYER, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's Motion for Orthopedic Examination and Diagnosis for Fracture Pelvis Bone, [Doc. No. 120]; plaintiff's Motion to Compel Defendant to Respond by Admitting or Denying Request for Admissions, [Doc. No. 123]; plaintiff's Motion for Appointment of Counsel, [Doc. No. 124]; plaintiff's Motion to Compel Investigation Report of Captain Meyers, [Doc. No. 129]; plaintiff's Amended Motion for Orthopedic Examination and Diagnosis for Fracture Pelvis Bone, [Doc. No. 130]; plaintiff's "Motion Re-Intering [sic] Informational Facts Presented by Plaintiff on his Motion for Rescual [sic] and Motion for Examination/Treatment, that This Court Failed to Address Issues, by Overlooking or Misinterpret," [Doc. No. 133]; plaintiff's Motion to Compel X-Rays, [Doc. No. 136]; plaintiff's Motion for Appointment of Counsel or a Legal Consultant, [Doc. No. 138].

The Court has previously ruled on several of these motions. Therefore, the following Motions are denied based on these previous rulings: plaintiff's Motion for Orthopedic Examination and Diagnosis for Fracture Pelvis Bone, [Doc. No. 120]; plaintiff's Motion for Appointment of Counsel, [Doc. No. 124] ; plaintiff's Amended Motion for Orthopedic Examination and Diagnosis for Fracture Pelvis Bone, [Doc. No. 130]; plaintiff's Motion for Appointment of Counsel or a Legal Consultant, [Doc. No. 138].

Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Defendant to Respond by Admitting or Denying his Requests for Admissions, [Doc. No. 123], is denied. Defendant answered the Requests for Admissions or objected to the requests, and even answered subject to the objections when he could. In those instances where defendant did not answer, his objections are sustained.

Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Investigation Report of Captain Meyers, [Doc. No. 129], is denied. Defendant has advised the Court that the document may contain confidential information regarding employee discipline and may put the safety and security of the Department of Corrections and its employees at risk. It further is protected by the attorney client privilege.

Plaintiff seeks a copy of the X-ray taken in June, [Doc. No. 136]. The motion is granted. Defendant shall furnish a copy of the X-ray of his pelvis bone taken in June, 2006 within 7 days from the date of this Order.

Plaintiff's "Motion Re-Intering [sic] Informational Facts Presented by Plaintiff on his Motion for Rescual [sic] and Motion for Examination/Treatment, that This Court Failed to Address Issues, by Overlooking or Misinterpret," [Doc. No. 133], which the Court construes as a Motion for Reconsideration is denied. The Court has articulated its reasoning for previous rulings and will therefore not readdress these issues.

Dated this 27th day of July, 2006.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Henry Edward Autrey", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

HENRY EDWARD AUTREY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE